



TOWN OF LOOMIS
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Blue Goose Event Center
3550 Taylor Road
Loomis, CA 95650

2

NOTE: THE MEETING LOCATION IS AT THE BLUE GOOSE

WEDNESDAY

March 14, 2018

6:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER: 6:32 PM

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

☒ Chairman Hogan
☐ Commissioner Kelly
☒ Commissioner Wilson
☒ Commissioner Obranovich
☒ Commissioner Clark-Crets

COMMISSION COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA - None

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA -

Dennis Olivera – Rachel Lane: Voiced concern on the effectiveness of the website and transparency. Voiced concern over unregulated capitalism and the negative effects on our town and society.

Linda Hart – Commented on the number of outdated signs around town.

This time is reserved for those in the audience who wish to address the Planning Commission on subjects that are not on the Agenda. The audience should be aware that the Council may not discuss details or vote on non-agenda items. Your concerns may be referred to staff or placed on the next available agenda. **The time allotted to each speaker is three minutes but can be changed by the Chairman.**

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

If items on the Agenda will be rescheduled for a different day and time, it will be announced at this time. Speakers are requested to restrict comments to the item as it appears on the agenda and stay within a three minute time limit. The Chairman has the discretion of limiting the total discussion time for an item.

Motion to adopt agenda: Wilson 2nd: Obranovich

Ayes: Wilson, Hogan, Clark-Crets, Obranovich

Noes: 0

Absent: Kelly

Abstain: 0

PUBLIC COMMENT ON CONSENT AGENDA - none

CONSENT AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION

1. February 27, 2018 MINUTES

APPROVE

Motion to adopt agenda: Wilson 2nd: Clark-Crets

Ayes: Wilson, Clark-Crets, Obranovich, Hogan

Noes: 0

Absent: Kelly

Abstain: 0

PUBLIC HEARING

2. #14-05 THE VILLAGE AT LOOMIS PROJECT (CONTINUED FROM JANUARY 23, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING)

To consider amending the Loomis General Plan; Rezoning the Project Site to the Planned Development (PD) District; Approve the Village at Loomis Preliminary Development Plan, Development Standards, and Design Guidelines; Approve Specific Development Plans for Village Areas 1, 2 and 3; Approve the Village at Loomis Tentative Subdivision Map; and the Village at Loomis Development Agreement; subject to the Certification of the Village at Loomis Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) as required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

Applicant: Village at Loomis LLC.

Town Manager Sean Rabe', presented power point outlining comments brought forward at last meeting and asked for commissioners' to direct staff on project direction.

COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS TO STAFF:

Commissioner Wilson: asked about tree mitigation plan – questioned amount of private space required for the Village Traditional homes – asked for a clear description on the placement of the sound wall near Doc Barnes – Clarified that the purpose of the SPMUD diversion line is for the good of the entire town as we (the town of Loomis) had reached capacity with the existing lines, restating that purpose was not to exclusively serve the Village Project.

Sean Rabe' Town manager asked Planning Commission to be specific about what commission want to see in this project in regards to setbacks, lot size and lot coverage

Commissioner Clark-Crets: Voiced concerns and positives of the project. Biggest concerns are lot sizes, small setbacks and the buffer/setback margins for the homes bordering Day Ave. Made a motion for the commission to direct staff to include the following in the conditions of approval: Use the existing RM 3.5 zoning district standards (3500 sq ft minimum lot size, 20 ft rear setback, 15 ft front setback and a combined 20ft side setback with neither side less than 5 ft; 50% maximum lot coverage) for all three areas; with a modification of a 3200 sq ft minimum lot size for the Village Residential and the Village Green areas. In the Village Traditional area, 4000 sq ft minimum lot size with the setbacks and the lot coverage mirroring the existing RM 3.5 existing zoning district, adding that all homes in the Village Traditional area adjoining David and Silverthorne be single story only. With no second to the motion, and a reluctance to let the motion die, commissioner Clark-Crets requested the motion be tabled to allow for discussion among the commissioners and staff- Chairman Hogan tabled the motion.

Directive was restated as:

Staff is directed to include the following items in the conditions of approval:

Village Traditional: 4000 sq ft lot minimum size

5' side setbacks, 18' front yard setback to the garage and 10' front setback to the house., and a 15' rear setback for all homes except the homes backing up to existing homes on David and Silver Ranch, where the rear setback will be 20' and single story only.

Village Green Court: 3000 sq foot minimum lot size

5' side setback; Front setbacks - 0' on the Green Court and 10' on the private lots. 4' from the alley in the rear

Village Residential: 3000 sq foot minimum lot size

5' side setback; Front setbacks - 0' on the Green Court and 10' on the private lots. 4' from the alley in the rear.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Tim Smith – Barton Road: Strong community feel that Proposed project is dramatically different than what was originally proposed – Is opposed to the project

Ramona Brockman – Ridge Road: Stated that project is an infill project and follows smart growth recommendations for higher density in the town's downtown core.

Jackie Euer- King Road: Voiced concern over the process – believes Planning Commission should not be in the position to change zoning. Tree planting should take place and not in-lieu fee payment. Wants only single story housing adjacent to Day Ave track. Also is opposed to the 3 story development in the High Density housing area.

Dot Shiro – Gave congratulations on the tenacity of the developers and those in favor of the project. Stated the smart growth was important to the original town founders

Dennis Oliveria – Rachel Lane: Thanks for the hard work, opposed to the process, stating it is not effective.

Steve Alston – Silverthorne: Voiced continued concern about the traffic, Opposed to in-lieu fees instead of planting. Stated the project is too dense.

Marvin Peterson – Thornwood: Is in favor of the project, would like density lowered some, but positives outweigh the negative.

Chris Heberd – 3rd generation Loomis resident: Spoke in favor of the project. Rooftops will provide revenue to the business's in the town. Asked for respect to the David ave residents.

Jeannie- Horseshoe Bar Road: Voice concern about the traffic caused by the project and concerned about the decline in property value in the area.

William Queneville – Horseshoe Bar Road: Stated the process is difficult. Voiced serious concern about the traffic caused by the project.

Gary Liss – Gold Trail: Voiced concern about increased traffic due to the project, pedestrian traffic across Horseshoe Bar Road, wants to see only single story homes on the lots adjacent to David Ave., no alley loaded housing, concerned about the tree mitigation / in-lieu plan, expressed the need to pursue the Swetzer Rd extension.

Nicole Dayton – King Road: Voiced concern about the impact on our local schools.

Chris Alston- Silver Ranch: Is pleased about the 20ft rear setback requirement, does not want the pop-up style on the houses adjacent to the Day track homes, voiced concern about the lot size.

Molly – Laird Road: Voiced concern about the future of the town, safety for the kids and wants larger lot sizes.

Heather – Hickey Lane: Voiced concern on the impact to our local schools and also the traffic impacts.

Shelly Richardson – David Ave: Voiced gratitude that the concerns of the Day track residents were heard and addressed.

John- local property owner: Owns duplexes on Thornwood / Laird Road: Voiced concern about the small lot sizes and the parking issues that come with small lot sizes.

Richard Cary – Myrtle Ave: Opposed to small lot sizes – wants project rejected and an new alternative plan brought forward.

Hayden- Arcadia: Opposed to project – Not "rural"

Meeting adjourned, item continued to 3/27/2018 - 7pm at the Blue Goose

ADJOURNMENT: 9:56:PM

PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURE:

1. Town staff makes its presentation on the Project and outlines all recommended actions
2. Commission/Council asks questions of staff
3. Chair/Mayor opens the public hearing
4. Applicant makes its presentation – 15 minutes (At the discretion of the mayor or chair, time may be extended depending on the size/scope of the proposed project. The applicant must make the request for a time extension prior to the beginning of the meeting.)
5. Commission/Council asks questions of the applicant (and staff)
6. Public comment – maximum 3 minutes per speaker, one opportunity to speak each
7. Applicant opportunity to respond to public comments – 3 minutes (At the discretion of the mayor or chair, time may be extended depending on the number of comments made during public comment.)
8. Chair/Mayor closes the public hearing is closed
9. Staff responds to all public comments; Commission/Council asks any additional questions of staff
10. Council deliberates and acts on requested entitlements

Carol Parker, Administrative Clerk/Planning Assistant